

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 487

SP 018/115

AUTHOR Stedman, Donald J.
 TITLE Improving Teacher Education: Academic Program Review.
 INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
 PUB DATE 80
 NOTE 13p.
 AVAILABLE FROM Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30313. (\$2.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Accountability: Accreditation (Institutions):
 *Educational Quality: *Evaluation Criteria:
 *Evaluation Methods: Higher Education: *Program
 Evaluation: *Schools of Education: Self Evaluation
 (Groups): State Standards: *Teacher Education
 Programs: Teacher Effectiveness: Teacher Supply and
 Demand

IDENTIFIERS *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

A general discussion of the quality of teacher education program evaluation is presented. Program evaluations typically go beyond assessment of minimum standards to more comprehensive reviews of: (1) the strengths and weaknesses of programs; (2) the effectiveness of the "products" of the educational activity; (3) the relationship of the programs to such "external" factors as demand for graduates; (4) productivity of the program; (5) specific characteristics of faculty, students, curricula, facilities, and resources available for program improvement; and (6) the energy, competence, and vitality of program leadership. The key features of a program review are outlined, and the major findings are listed. Recommendations are made for improvement of evaluation of teacher education programs. Some specific program evaluation activities in Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia are described. (JD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
 * from the original document.

ED 205467

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Schultz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
- ☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

Improving Teacher Education: Academic Program Review

Donald J. Stedman
Acting Vice President for
Research and Public Service Programs
The University of North Carolina

130 Sixth Street, N.W. • Atlanta, Georgia 30313 • 1980 • \$2.00

Southern Regional Education Board

Foreword

Improving the quality of instruction in elementary and secondary schools is a major public issue that is receiving new attention from our colleges and universities. Higher education's concern for the quality of elementary and secondary education is appropriate and necessary for a number of reasons, including two of central importance. First, the quality of higher education cannot be divorced from the quality of schools that prepare entering freshmen. And secondly, higher education produces the teachers and administrators for our elementary and secondary schools.

Efforts to improve quality are taking many forms: competency testing of both students and teachers, higher teacher salaries, tighter standards for admission to colleges of education, and altered requirements for teacher certification.

Evaluating the collegiate programs that prepare teachers is another important effort at improving quality. Programs are being rigorously examined in many states in ways that go beyond the traditional accreditation procedures. These evaluations will not yield overnight results, but they can be an important part of an overall effort to improve our schools. Donald Stedman, acting vice president for research and public service programs of the University of North Carolina, headed the North Carolina review of its more than 500 education degree programs. Dr. Stedman has described briefly the background of teacher education program review, actions in a number of Southern states, and he offers views on what evaluations have found and what future actions are needed.

Emphasis on teacher education program review is the latest in a number of teacher education activities by the Southern Regional Education Board over the past 30 years. Other recent efforts include projections on teacher supply and demand, a review of state teacher reciprocity agreements, and a report on state teacher certification actions. These efforts to improve the quality of education in the South will continue to be an important concern of SREB.

Winfred L. Godwin
President

Facing the Quality Issue in Teacher Education

Over the past decade, steady rumblings about the quality of education, the effectiveness of the public schools, and the competency of teachers have spread across the nation and are gathering intensity, especially in the South. New and expanded testing programs for students at all levels of elementary and secondary education have been initiated throughout the region. Passing minimum competency tests is now required for graduation from some high schools, and more stringent licensing and certification tests confront aspiring teachers in many SREB states.

Serious misgivings exist about the peer evaluation process used throughout the country to accredit and approve public schools and institutions of higher education. Many school teachers and school of education faculties alike doubt whether the current school systems are adequately designed, funded, staffed, or governed to meet the educational expectations of our society. In fact, public education in America today may be at one of the lowest points of public confidence in its history. When the cover of *Time* magazine shouts "Teacher Can't Teach," and when a prominent state periodical echoes "because they don't know anything," serious damage is being done to the reputation of a profession striving to improve its lot and its effectiveness in an age when the professions generally are under attack.

While the more visible aspects of education have been the primary targets of public concern, i.e., schools, teachers, children, parents, and school boards, the principal origins of teachers—teacher education programs in colleges and universities—have been quietly subjecting themselves to self-analysis, review, evaluation, and reappraisal. Some self-examinations are more rigorous than others. A few of the reviews have had an eye toward escaping the searching light of blame for the shortcomings of the public schools. But many others are an active part of the needed renewal of the structure and processes of public education and schooling.

In 1978-79, of the 1,962 four-year senior institutions in the nation, 545 had accredited programs for preparing teachers, educational administrators, or other specialists for the schools; 166 were in the 14 SREB states. In 1978, 47,321 baccalaureate degrees in education were awarded in the SREB region, nearly 20 percent of all of the baccalaureate degrees awarded that year. In 1978, 48 percent of all master's degrees awarded in the South were in education (39,360).¹

Clearly, teacher education is a major enterprise, and a significant portion of the resources of higher education in the South is being applied to the education, training, and continuing professional development of teachers.

The majority of schools of education operate relatively small undergraduate teacher education programs. However, a few institutions—traditionally teachers' colleges, but also including major universities—prepare large numbers of teachers. The majority of the predominantly black institutions in the South were founded as teachers' colleges and continue to emphasize teacher education.

Over the years, teacher education programs have been exposed to much of the same faddism, to many of the same stresses, and to some of the same loss of respect within the university that the public schools have suffered in the community. A number of trends have affected teacher education programs, including the shifts toward "reality" education, the development of teacher centers, emphasis on field-experiences for students, and more involvement of public school personnel in teacher preparation; the ascendance of competency-based teacher education; emphases on vocational or career education; and the impact of computer and communications technology on teaching. These factors have had a stretching effect—some might say a diluting effect—on the quality of teacher education programs.

The drop in the ability levels of students entering teacher education is another major factor that is often cited as a cause of the perceived decline in quality. Some would say that eagerness to provide access to higher education may be overriding an equally important regard for the readiness required of persons to enter a profession which demands articulate and intelligent people of high character and motivation to teach.

The result has been that many schools of education find themselves in disarray in a period requiring staff renewal, reallocations of budgets, reassignment of priorities, selective student admissions, and organizational renewal. The latent "respect gap" that has lingered between education and the arts and sciences has surfaced again, and higher education administrators are shuffling the leadership in schools of education to see if some new approach can be devised to improve the quality and effectiveness of graduates, and to bring the production of new teachers into better balance with a shrinking employment market. All this is in the face of enrollment declines when budgets in higher education are geared to enrollment.

Until recent years, rigorous evaluation of academic programs has been confined largely to reviews required by external agencies, governmental and private, as a condition of continued financial support. The bulk of academic programs, once initiated, were seldom disturbed except by occasional reviews to ascertain readiness for accreditation visits or in response to institutional planning. Questions addressed in rare evaluation activities usually related to alternative ways of doing business, rather than whether business was productive, effective, or even desirable.

Teacher Education in the Age of Accountability

The new wave of concern for the quality and supply of teachers, the troubled economy, and projected decreases in the size of public school enrollments brought this tranquil life to a halt and thrust teacher education programs into an age of accountability unlike any they have experienced since Sputnik. In the SREB region, this reappraisal of teacher education has been active, positive, and substantial. But it is too soon to tell how much will result, or for how long. Serious program review has been initiated in several states—some by legislatures, some by university leadership, some by the governing boards of statewide systems of higher education. For the most part, this increase in academic program reviews has been occurring in publicly-supported institutions. The private institutions of higher education have not generally initiated such evaluations. However, as the private sector lays claim to more public funds at the state level, it may inherit the accountability of the public sector.

Improving Quality Despite Supply and Demand Changes

During much of the Seventies, supply and demand data have been analyzed in order to bring the production of teacher education programs into better balance with projected needs. Such projections are very difficult to develop and are not suitable as sole sources for public policy formulation. Nevertheless, they are important, since supply and demand factors, and projections, can affect quality.

National Education Association (NEA) surveys have indicated a steady decline in numbers of education graduates since 1972, but there is still a sizable surplus. In 1978, NEA reported that "about half of the new teachers found teaching jobs in the fall following their graduation." For 1979, NEA reported that graduates looking for positions in 1979 exceeded the jobs available by 58,750, but areas of shorter supply continued in math, agriculture, natural and physical sciences, and vocational and technical areas.²

In periods of oversupply, it is easier to evaluate programs in order to cut back. But in periods of teacher shortage, sometimes there is an inclination to ease up and respond to the "market" at the expense of quality. The temptation to ease up should be resisted, since it is only the logistical and expedient response to a problem and not in the best interests of public education.

A recent SREB report, projected that "the supply of new teachers in the Southern region to the mid-Eighties will be in closer balance with demand than has been the case in recent years."³ If, indeed, a changing labor market does occur and supply and demand come into closer balance, educational and political leaders may have to voice ever greater support to maintain the emphasis on quality improvement.

Accreditation and Program Evaluation

Several major organizations provide regular review of existing and developing institutions of higher education to accredit teacher education programs in accordance with standards and criteria devised by the profession. Regional accrediting associations are in place throughout the nation, and state education agencies have accrediting and approval authority for their teacher education programs. A national organization, the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), provides regular review on request. Dozens of specific educational discipline areas have state, regional, and national review and accrediting services.

Nearly all accrediting activities follow essentially the same pattern—an institutional self-study is followed by a two- or three-day on-site visit and review is conducted by peers. This peer-evaluation approach has merit, but it also has shortcomings. Some of the persons serving as peers are not sufficiently experienced or trained to be accreditors. Recommendations of accreditation teams are often not quickly implemented, if at all, and they are not generally enforced in any measurable way.

In some states, the state education agency program review process has amounted to routine approval, but many states are moving to strengthen their standards and procedures for approving teacher education programs. Still, these processes seldom produce concrete curricular or administrative recommendations that can be implemented, and it is rare to see a program disapproved. State agencies and legislatures have attempted to remedy this problem through revision of their licensing standards and procedures. One result of this approach has been to raise the failure rate on licensing exams and curtail admission to the profession with tests or procedures increasingly challenged in the courts as discriminatory.

In the past few years, institutions have begun to focus on quality in teacher education programs and on methods for evaluating their effectiveness to provide program improvement data as well as information for sound and fair administrative judgments. It has been surprising, and encouraging, that decisions to discontinue or sharply curtail certain teacher education programs have been made on the basis of quality as well as productivity and need; at times, this has resulted in the discontinuation of programs recently accredited.

As a result of the dual needs to make tough administrative decisions about allocating scarce resources and to focus on quality, the traditional self-study and peer review accreditation approaches have gradually given way to more rigorous review by external agencies to reach decisions on program revision, program improvement, funding, or program continuation. This shift has been due in part to strategies developed by private foundations and governmental agencies to assess the strengths of organizations seeking funds.

Unfortunately, accreditation is still sometimes confused with program evaluation. Program evaluations typically go beyond assessment of minimum standards to more comprehensive reviews of the strengths and weaknesses of programs, the effectiveness of the "products" of the educational activity, and the relationship of the programs to such "external" factors as demand for graduates, productivity of the program, and specific characteristics of faculty, students, curricula, facilities, and resources available for program improvement, and the energy, competence, and vitality of program leadership.

Two major strategies for assessing teacher education programs are most prominent. The first is the accrediting or licensing approach. Here, standards are arrived at by pooling knowledge of "good practice" or apparent minimal features of training programs which should be present and operating in order to turn out a "good" product. These standards usually relate to curricula, faculty, students, resources, practical training experiences, and often some end-point assessment (test) to reflect the presence or absence of knowledge and competence in the graduates of the training activity. The standards are usually set by peers who visit the training program and use their own subjective experience as a yardstick to see if "minimal standards" are present in the program. Quality and effectiveness of the program are then inferred from the judgments of the peer review team.

The second major strategy is to attempt to judge the effectiveness of the teacher education program by measuring the effectiveness of the performance of its graduates in the "real" setting—the classroom and the school. The inclination here is to obtain evaluations of performance by on-site supervisors, by trained independent teams of observers, through self-evaluation or, occasionally, by assessing learning and performance changes in the children taught by the teachers being evaluated. Program quality and

effectiveness are then inferred by measures of teacher behavior, learner performance, or some combination of the two.

The first strategy is highly subjective, variable, and is based on seeing that minimal standards are met. The second strategy is weakened by a lack of adequate research data on measures of teacher effectiveness and child performance and the present inability to make strong connections between training program features, teacher behavior on the job, and learner performance. It is an exceedingly complex area requiring expensive and time-consuming research as yet undone.

Key Features of Program Review

If effective and useful teacher education program evaluation is to be undertaken, several important features should be included:

- Criteria that will provide benchmarks against which program effectiveness can be measured should be selected *before* the review. The most important of these are *quality, present and future need, and productivity*.
- Information-gathering activities used to assess the programs should be planned carefully and should involve key persons in the programs to be evaluated.
- The evaluation should be designed from the beginning to produce information that will help to improve the programs and yield data for making administrative decisions regarding them.
- The review should take place over a relatively short period—12 to 18 months at a maximum—so as to yield findings and recommendations that are based on current operations.
- The reviewers should be from outside the institutions whose programs are being evaluated to aid objectivity and credibility and to avoid potential conflicts of interest. State higher education governing and coordinating boards are the agencies in the best position to conduct such reviews.
- Program evaluations should be as open and "public" as possible.
- Issues of program *cost* should be considered, but should not be the primary criteria for continuing or terminating programs. Certainly there is a relationship between cost and quality, but most reviewers agree that cost data alone will not provide information on program effectiveness or need for graduates.
- The performance of graduates of the teacher education programs being reviewed should be assessed in order to judge the effectiveness of the programs. This requires special surveys and a data collection system that ideally should be constructed prior to initiating the review.
- Program administrators need opportunities to respond to initial recommendations before judgments are made and final decisions are reached. This may require "hearings" on initial recommendations, or the development of program improvement plans by the institutions being evaluated.

What Have Reviews of Teacher Education Programs Found?

Some of the major findings of the program reviews include:

1. The majority of teacher education programs evaluated are sufficiently strong and effective to be continued and improved. Many programs are overproductive in areas of low demand, however, and their institutions need to reallocate their resources and reorganize to meet the needs of high demand programs, such as mathematics, reading education, special education, and preschool education.
2. Some institutions of higher education appear to be placing too large a portion of their institutional resources in teacher education, thus limiting their other program offerings. Other institutions are attempting to offer teacher education as an added recruitment device but have inadequate staff and do not provide the necessary resources to assure the preparation of effective and successful teachers.
3. Few institutions have a regular means of gathering specific information about the success or failure of their graduates. Some institutions have attempted to develop systems to follow up on their graduates, but the

major sources of information are the results of licensing or certification exams required by state boards of education. The performances of graduates on these licensing examinations are important sources of information on the effectiveness of the teacher education programs, but more detail is needed to improve the programs.

4. At many institutions, there is a weak relationship between the arts and sciences departments and the schools of education. Often this has led to inadequate preparation, either in content or in methods of teaching, of teachers who wish to enter secondary education.

5. Reviews generally reveal that the level of competency of students in teacher education programs is not as high as students enrolled in other programs. Special efforts to recruit better students into teacher education meet with little success, since the low demand and relatively low pay scale for teachers is widely known among students.

6. The "normal school" is alive and well in the South—that is, the traditional preparation of teachers on the campus and the clear separation between teacher training programs and the public schools is still the characteristic way in which teachers are prepared. New teacher education program models are required which involve the public schools more closely and take into account more regularly the experiences of graduates of the programs.

7. There is insufficient coordination of planning and program development among institutions of higher education and state departments of education, between public and private higher education institutions, and between higher education and the local schools.

8. Most reviews indicate that there is an adequate supply of new doctoral degree holders in the field of education but that there is a need for improved access to doctoral level training, particularly in educational administration and supervision, for those educational administrators who work full time in the schools and, therefore, cannot become full-time students. This is partly a function of the increasing relationship between salary schedules in the public schools and levels of training attained. It is also a function of the need to redesign the administration and management training programs now used to educate leadership for the public schools.

9. There is not sufficient educational research and program evaluation capacity in most institutions of higher education. Applied research and program evaluation, often tied to planning and budgeting procedures, are increasingly necessary features of an effective teacher education program.

10. Comparatively low teacher turnover in some states and consequent increased demand for in-service education programs to "update" teachers and disseminate new knowledge and practice have expanded extension and in-service education needs.

Recommendations for Future Actions

The improvement of teacher education programs cannot be accomplished by some isolated, on-campus revival, but a tougher stance on the issues of quality and productivity has to be taken by the leadership of institutions of higher education and the directors of teacher education programs. Program leadership cannot rely exclusively on internal or external evaluation activities to assure program improvement and the effective operation of teacher education programs. Leadership must come from within, and initiatives must be taken before external pressures are applied.

The quality and productivity of many teacher education programs have eroded, and concerted efforts must be undertaken in cooperation with the public schools and with other agencies to improve these programs. Finding accommodations among the varying goals and objectives of these various agencies and organizations is not a simple assignment. However, the political, economic, and professional realities of the 1980s require a cooperative approach in any serious effort to improve the quality and effectiveness of teacher education programs. Attempts to improve teacher education through more stringent and appropriate credentialing must leave room for diversity of curriculum, for the freedom of academe to invent new and better ways to "prepare" teachers, and for a re-emphasis on the arts, sciences, and humanities in undergraduate studies.

Higher Education Agencies Should Do the Evaluations

The agencies in the best position to conduct teacher education program evaluations are the statewide higher education coordinating or governing boards. These agencies are sufficiently "external" to the institutions to be objective, credible, and effective in program review activities. At the same time, they are sufficiently "internal" to be familiar with each of the institutions involved—their missions, stages of development, their capacity to improve and to serve, and unique contributions to statewide educational activities. They are in the best position to view field-based extension and continuing educational needs, and interinstitutional options available to meet on- and off-campus educational needs. Since these agencies interact with the governor, the legislature, and the institutions, they are in the best position to conduct and to interpret the results and recommendations of program reviews and to advocate proposed actions for teacher education program improvement. They share responsibility for the quality of the programs offered in the state's institutions.

Evaluation Should Lead to Specific Improvements

An evaluation system is required to provide: improved procedures for admission to teacher education programs; a practical basis for curriculum improvement; a more effective approach to the improvement of the quality of graduates; a more successful strategy for in-service education; a more defensible testing and certification schedule; and a better response to teacher supply and demand factors. Many program evaluations have recommended the establishment of an improved management information system that would regularly provide follow-up information on graduates or other features that could improve the program and the effectiveness of its graduates. Such systems should grow in number and become regional in scope.

A More Aggressive Search Is Needed for Better Teachers

One of the special problems of the Eighties will be to attract better people into the classrooms—in public schools and in higher education—and keep them there. This will require not only tougher standards but more effective recruitment, better pay, and other non-monetary incentives for teachers.

States Should Devise Better Quality Benchmarks

The measurement techniques required for effective program evaluations are generally adequate, but with increased demand for evaluations what is adequate today may not be so in the future. More reliable and valid procedures must be developed for assessing program quality and professional effectiveness of teachers. A concerted effort among institutions in the state and in the region must be made to identify new methods and measures of evaluation that will be practical and fair.

Institutions Should Prepare for Major Shifts in Teacher Education

Decreased teacher turnover, reduced enrollments, a decline in the number of teacher education programs, diminishing economic resources, and the costs of scarce energy resources, all point to major shifts in emphasis in teacher education. There will be shifts from predominantly pre-service professional educational enterprises to predominantly in-service professional development activities; from predominantly undergraduate to predominantly graduate professional education programs; and from predominantly on-campus to more off-campus educational activities. This will require a reassessment of the policies and procedures currently used by institutions of higher education to engage in extension instruction in both degree related and non-degree related education.

Access to In-service and Off-campus Education Should Be Improved

There is a need for a more effective system of in-service education on a statewide basis that will provide improved access to post-baccalaureate level education and, increasingly, access to post-master's degree training, including doctoral programs in education. This will require a very careful assessment of the current policies and procedures and standards for conducting and evaluating off-campus professional education programs for improving access and for avoiding any further erosion in the quality and effectiveness of the graduates of teacher education programs.

Teacher Education May Need a Different Funding Approach

There is already a noticeable reduction in the enrollment of students in teacher education programs concurrent with the implementation of more stringent program admissions procedures. This fact will eventually require special funding alternatives for teacher education programs if the improvement activities related to these programs are to continue and be effective. Enrollment-driven budgets in publicly-supported institutions of higher education—the major producer of teachers—may have to be reassessed as a funding strategy, at least in the case of the professional teacher education programs.

Preparation of High School Teachers Needs Reform

A consistent finding of program evaluations has been that secondary teacher education programs are particularly weak. This underscores the need to improve linkages between teacher education programs and the arts and sciences departments at colleges and universities. Also, this points to the need to reform secondary education generally, not only at institutions of higher education but in the public schools.

Teacher Education Can Prepare Graduates for Other Fields

There is a need to recognize that there are many agencies, organizations, and human service systems that require personnel with the competencies and characteristics of the graduates of schools of education and teacher education programs. This so-called "nontraditional market" is expanding and includes mental health, rehabilitation, corrections, industrial, research, public service, and private educational organizations. Greater emphasis in teacher education programs should be placed on the development of professional educators for these activities.

Innovative Methods Should Be Evaluated and Shared Promptly

We must review options for validating and disseminating effective, innovative teaching practices. States must be able to describe or demonstrate new teacher education models, new and innovative teaching practices, recently developed and evaluated educational materials, and to provide technical assistance to put them to work. Institutions of higher education and teacher education programs are not sufficiently involved in this process.

Teacher Education Faculty Need Stronger Ties to Local Schools

There is a need to engage in more effective faculty development programs of teacher education in institutions of higher education. Those who educate and train teachers are the most important feature of teacher education programs. These faculty members must be well trained, experienced, and "in touch" with the educational organizations in which their graduates are being employed.

The Public Must Know the Good and Bad News About Teacher Education

A comprehensive and systematic public education program must be devised to inform the general public about the continuing and basic strengths of institutions of higher education and their teacher education programs. The majority of programs reviewed have been found to be strong and effective programs, educating people for whom there are jobs and who are effective educators in the public schools and other educational settings. This consistent and principal finding is often lost among the discussions of quality, supply and demand factors, and the apparent erosion in quality of the schools. It is important to provide information to, but not to propagandize, members of the legislature, members of the boards and commissions responsible for higher education, members of the agencies responsible for administering the public schools, and the business corporate community.

Teacher Education Program Review in the South

A survey of academic program review activities in Southern states indicates that several are actively involved in the evaluation of their teacher education activities. The most comprehensive reviews have been undertaken in Florida and North Carolina. Kentucky is completing a review of all master's programs and other states are developing plans to evaluate undergraduate programs in the near future.

Some specific activities in several states follow.

Florida

The State University System of Florida initiated a review of teacher education programs in 1976 among its nine publicly-supported institutions of higher education.

This review was stimulated by legislators who perceived an oversupply of teachers in Florida at the time, by public concern about the quality of instruction in the public schools, and by claims from the institutions of higher education that schools of education were being underfunded.

The evaluation of teacher education programs was both an internal and an external review—that is, it used staff members from the central administration of the University System and the State Board of Education as well as other persons in Florida in the area of teacher education. Consultants were engaged to conduct site visits and to focus on the quality as well as the productivity of programs.

A systemwide report was developed and circulated among legislators, State University System personnel, and the Board of Regents which set out the specific findings and recommendations of the evaluation activity. Recommendations made by the Regents resulted in a number of actions, including (1) the development of specific new programs at selected institutional sites, (2) increased cooperation among institutions of higher education in the Florida System, including some joint programs between Florida State University and Florida A&M, (3) a specific SAT score requirement for entry into teacher education, (This was deleted by the State Board of Education but later required by legislative action.) (4) the development of better liaison between the State Board of Education and the University System, and between the System and the community colleges, (5) the development of new procedures for initiating academic programs in the University System, (6) the development of an improved program inventory system, (7) increased minority student recruitment, and (8) a number of consolidations of existing programs; no programs were discontinued.

Kentucky

In 1973, a moratorium on the creation of new programs was placed on institutions of higher education by the Kentucky Council on Higher Education. Since that time, program reviews have been completed for all disciplines at the doctoral level, including teacher education programs.

In 1977, a comprehensive review of master's degree level programs was initiated and a final report will be available soon. This review was essentially an in-house review of all disciplines, including education. The Council is planning a review of all baccalaureate level programs.

A March 1980 report on teacher education resulted in an excellent articulation of issues in Kentucky, including the results of a review of teacher manpower needs which addresses the supply and demand issue. This study indicated that there is currently a surplus of teacher education graduates, even though there has been a 38 percent decline in graduates since 1973. An even more rapid decline in the market for teachers has also taken place during the same period.

The study concluded that a new professional examination is needed to license teachers, found that there is currently no unnecessary duplication of programs, and concluded that there is a need for more access to doctoral level study in Kentucky. The report included a recommendation that admission of students to baccalaureate level teacher education programs should be based upon an increased consideration of the needs of the "market place," and a criterion-referenced test was recommended.

The Council further recommended that (1) each state-supported university submit an annual report providing placement data on its teacher education graduates, (2) the Council on Higher Education and the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education publish an annual report describing employment trends for teacher education graduates, (3) the independent colleges and universities in Kentucky cooperate in the improvement of their teacher education programs, (4) all institutions adjust admissions to specific teacher education programs in relation to the specific needs for graduates of such programs, (5) the present teacher education laboratory schools be converted to specialized centers to train teachers of exceptional children, (6) the coordination of in-service education activities for teachers in Kentucky be expanded and improved, and (7) a special teacher education information system and data bank be developed and assigned to a single agency for maintenance and updating. Kentucky, like Florida and North Carolina, is rapidly developing a comprehensive teacher education improvement program in concert with the state education agency and the Kentucky Education Association.

Louisiana

Program reviews by the Louisiana Board of Regents began in 1975 at the doctoral level across all types of programs, including education.

In 1979, plans were made to review teacher education programs among the 21 public and private institutions of higher education in Louisiana. The method of reviewing the programs includes completion of comprehensive self-reviews and one-day visits by specially selected consultant teams. All of the team members are from out-of-state and the focus is on the quality, effectiveness, and need for the teacher education programs, both regionally and statewide. The teacher education program review activity is expected to be completed in the fall of 1980 and Board actions on the report will take place in early 1981.

North Carolina

The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina completed a comprehensive review and evaluation of all teacher education programs in 1977. Baccalaureate, master's and doctoral level programs at 15 of the 16 constituent institutions of the University of North Carolina system were reviewed by a large number of external consultants. The evaluation focused principally on the *quality* and *productivity* of all of the teacher education programs and a special study of North Carolina's *need* for graduates of such programs. This combination of *quality*, *productivity*, and *need* as evaluation criteria constituted the basis for a number of general and specific recommendations, one of which was to discontinue more than 50 programs.

Sixteen of the 18 recommendations made in the Teacher Education Review Program report adopted by the Board of Governors have been, or are being, implemented. Of the 500 undergraduate and graduate education programs reviewed in 1976-77, 377 have been continued as either *strong* or *satisfactory* teacher education activities. Forty-two of the 377 programs have undergone significant improvements since 1978. Fifty-four teacher education programs have been discontinued and 69 will remain under review through fall 1980.

The report recommended greater cooperation and coordinated planning between the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education. This led to a joint effort by the two Boards to revise the standards and procedures for licensing teachers and the standards and guidelines for approving teacher education programs in North Carolina's public and private colleges and universities.

A proposed "quality assurance program" developed by task groups in collaboration with the two Boards includes two major features. The first is a *three-point evaluation system* that would include *pre-teacher admissions screening* procedures, a procedure for the *conditional licensing of teachers* for a three-year period, and a *performance evaluation* for the continued licensing and education of teachers.

The second major feature is an *educational support system* which provides continuing education, training, and formal advanced education for qualified teachers, made possible through an organized link-up between the regional staff development system of the State Department of Public Instruction and the extension education programs of the public and private institutions of higher education, principally the University of North Carolina.

The general components of the Teacher Education Review Program include (1) a major comprehensive review and evaluation of all existing teacher education programs (already completed), (2) the development of a set of priorities, policies, and procedures for the establishment of new teacher education programs (currently being implemented), (3) cooperation with the State Board of Education in the revision of licensing and program approval standards and procedures (underway), (4) an emphasis on improved access to existing university graduate programs in education and leadership development (currently being planned), and (5) the establishment of research and development, technical assistance, and demonstration programs in the area of teacher education (still being discussed).

New programs in education have been established in accordance with the recommendations of the 1977 report and studies are underway to assess the need for graduate centers in various locations. Twenty-six new education programs have been initiated at nine institutions, all in high demand areas, including school psychology, reading education, special education, education of the deaf, and community education. In addition, the Board of Governors has authorized the planning of 11 new degree programs in education at eight institutions.

It is important to note that North Carolina is one of the few states *not* operating under a legislative mandate to revise teacher education or licensing approaches. This is due in large measure to the evaluation

initiatives of the University Board and the State Board of Education's actions to improve policies and procedures for licensing teachers.

Texas

In the fall of 1980 the Coordinating Board of the Texas College and University System will begin a statewide program review of doctoral programs offered at all Texas public universities. The reviews will be conducted on an academic discipline-by-discipline basis. In time these reviews will encompass all subdisciplines of education.

Outside consultants and an advisory committee made up of the graduate school deans of nine of the state's 20 public institutions currently offering doctoral programs are the principal persons involved in the assessment of these doctoral programs. At those institutions offering doctoral level programs and master's programs in the same discipline, both will be reviewed.

While the Coordinating Board has responsibility for the review of academic programs in all public institutions, other groups also have been created to study public education and teacher education. In 1979, the Texas legislature created a Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession. This group is recommending changes in procedures and criteria for training, certification, and renewal of public school teachers' certificates. A Governor's Committee on Public Education has completed a report and a set of recommendations on education for presentation to the legislature in 1981.

Virginia

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia regularly reviews program productivity of all academic degree programs in the public institutions. Programs determined to be insufficiently productive can be discontinued.

The Council has not yet planned a teacher education program review that would focus on undergraduate or master's degree level programs. However, the 1980 legislature called for institutions of higher education to review their admission standards for these programs and to report their findings to the Council of Higher Education. In addition, the legislature requested that the State Board of Education and the Council identify subject areas in which there may be shortages of teachers. Both public and private institutions of higher education are included, and the report to the legislature is due by December 1, 1981. An interim report will be filed in December 1980.

Footnotes

- 1 National Center for Education Statistics, *Education Directory, 1978-79: Colleges and Universities Offering Accredited Programs by Accreditation Field, Including Selected Characteristics 1977-78; and HEGIS survey of earned degrees, 1977-78, advance information.*
- 2 *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 7, 1980, p. 8
- 3 Eva C. Galambos, *The Changing Labor Market for Teachers in the South*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1980